

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

John Stritzinger,)	
)	
Appellant,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 3:15-cv-1219-TLW
)	
Bankruptcy Court,)	
)	
Interested Party.)	
_____)	

ORDER

Appellant Debtor John Stritzinger, proceeding pro se, appeals an order of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of South Carolina denying Stritzinger’s motion to reconsider and reopen a bankruptcy proceeding. (Doc. #1). On April 15, 2015, United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett, to whom this case was assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), (D.S.C.), issued an Order directing Stritzinger to submit the appropriate filing fee, a designation of the items to be included in the record on appeal, and a statement of the issues to be presented. (Doc. #5 at 2). Despite the Court’s warning that failure to comply with the Order could result in the dismissal of his appeal, Stritzinger failed to comply. Instead, Stritzinger filed a motion for reconsideration and a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. (Doc. #8, 10). On July 6, 2015, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (the “Report”) in which she recommends that the Bankruptcy Court’s order be affirmed, the appeal be dismissed, and Stritzinger’s motion for reconsideration and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis be denied. (Doc. #17). Stritzinger failed to file objections to the Report, and this matter is now ripe for disposition.

The Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained therein. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections to the Report, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, "a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Report in accordance with this standard, and it concludes that the Magistrate Judge accurately summarizes the case and the applicable law. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. #17). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the Bankruptcy Court's order is **AFFIRMED**, and this appeal is **DISMISSED**. (Doc. #1). Stritzinger's motions for reconsideration and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis are **DENIED**. (Doc. #8, 10).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten

Terry L. Wooten

Chief United States District Judge

July 24, 2015

Columbia, South Carolina